



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

*Am*

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR    | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|-----------------|-------------|-------------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 09/976,109      | 10/15/2001  | John Fitzgerald Riordan | 1817-0115P          | 9313             |

2292 7590 03/25/2005

BIRCH STEWART KOLASCH & BIRCH  
PO BOX 747  
FALLS CHURCH, VA 22040-0747

|          |
|----------|
| EXAMINER |
|----------|

ENGLAND, DAVID E

|          |              |
|----------|--------------|
| ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER |
|----------|--------------|

2143

DATE MAILED: 03/25/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/976,109

Applicant(s)

RIORDAN, JOHN FITZGERALD

Examiner

David E. England

Art Unit

2143

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 15 October 2001.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-126 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-126 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 15 October 2001 is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☒ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_\_.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_.

### **DETAILED ACTION**

1. Claims 1 – 126 are presented for examination.

#### ***Claim Objections***

2. Claims 1 – 126 are objected to because of the following informalities: There is numerous grammar mistakes throughout the claim language, for example, claim 9 states “a conferencing server having means to allow a user device contact the server”. It is suggested that this be worded as “a conferencing server having means for allow a user device to contact the server,” or the something similar without adding new matter. Please make the appropriate correction throughout the claims.

#### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101***

3. 35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

4. Claims 91, 92, 95, 102, 103, 106, 114, 117, 122, 123 and 126 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter.

5. Claims 91, 92, 95, 102, 103, 106, 114, 117, 122, 123 and 126 are not limited to tangible embodiments. In view of Applicant’s disclosure, specification page 20, lines 20 – 33, the

Art Unit: 2143

medium is not limited to tangible embodiments, instead being defined as including both tangible embodiments (e.g., magnetic storage media (e.g. ROMs, floppy disks, hard disks, etc-), optically readable media (e.g. CD-ROMs, DVDS, etc.) and carrier waves (e.g., transmissions over the internet) and intangible embodiments (e.g., program instructions). As such, the claim is not limited to statutory subject matter and is therefore non-statutory.

### *Drawings*

6. The drawings are objected to under 37 CFR 1.83(a). The drawings must show every feature of the invention specified in the claims. Therefore, the “server to aggregate the data to and from each user device” must be shown or the feature(s) canceled from the claim(s). No new matter should be entered.

7. The drawings are objected to under 37 CFR 1.83(a). The drawings must show every feature of the invention specified in the claims. Therefore, the “the access data to allow the user device to communicate with the contact is not available, the user first collections the necessary access data for storage” must be shown or the feature(s) canceled from the claim(s). No new matter should be entered.

Corrected drawing sheets in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(d) are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. Any amended replacement drawing sheet should include all of the figures appearing on the immediate prior version of the sheet, even if only one figure is being amended. The figure or figure number of an amended drawing should not be labeled as “amended.” If a drawing figure is to be canceled, the appropriate figure

Art Unit: 2143

must be removed from the replacement sheet, and where necessary, the remaining figures must be renumbered and appropriate changes made to the brief description of the several views of the drawings for consistency. Additional replacement sheets may be necessary to show the renumbering of the remaining figures. Each drawing sheet submitted after the filing date of an application must be labeled in the top margin as either "Replacement Sheet" or "New Sheet" pursuant to 37 CFR 1.121(d). If the changes are not accepted by the examiner, the applicant will be notified and informed of any required corrective action in the next Office action. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

8. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

9. Claims 1 – 126 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, because the specification, while being enabling for "access data", does not reasonably provide enablement for what "access data" consists of. The specification does not enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make or use the invention commensurate in scope with these claims. Throughout the application the Applicant claims an "access data" yet in the specification there is no definition nor example to enabled one of

Art Unit: 2143

ordinary skill in the art to make and use the entire scope of the claimed invention without undue experimentation.

10. All other claims that specifically do not state “access data” is rejected for the independent claims they depend on.

11. Claims 2 – 28, 64, 65, 75 and 76 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, because the specification does not reasonably provide enablement for “communication system simultaneously for contact with the one contact device”. The specification does not enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to use the invention commensurate in scope with these claims. Throughout the application the Applicant claims a “communication system simultaneously for contact with the one contact device” yet in the specification there is no definition nor example to enabled one of ordinary skill in the art to use the entire scope of the claimed invention without undue experimentation how the system simultaneously communicates with the devices.

12. All other claims that specifically do not state “communication system simultaneously for contact with the one contact device” is rejected for the independent claims they depend on.

13. Claims 13; 27, 36, 43, 50, 56, 61, 72 and 83 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed,

Art Unit: 2143

had possession of the claimed invention. The specification does not state what the acronym "SMS" stands for nor an example of what a "SMS message" consists of.

14. Claims 9, 69 and 80 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, because the specification, while being enabling for a conferencing server, does not reasonably provide enablement for a conferencing server having means to allow a user device contact the server.

The specification does not enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to use the invention commensurate in scope with these claims. The specification does not convey what or how the "means" will allow a user device contact the server.

15. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

16. Claims 9, 10, 15 – 17, 69 and 80 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

17. Claims 9, 69 and 80 recite the limitation "the server". There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

18. Claim 15 recites the limitation "the internet". There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Art Unit: 2143

19. Claim 16 recites the limitation "the extranet". There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

20. Claim 17 recites the limitation "the intranet". There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

21. In claim 10, it is unclear as to how or what the user device is nominated for, (i.e., nominated for allowed access to the system, nominated for being rejected access to the system). The only section of the specification that discusses this is the Brief Summary on page 5, which does not go into detail and only seems to be a copy of the claim language.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

22. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application by another who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371(c) of this title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.

The changes made to 35 U.S.C. 102(e) by the American Inventors Protection Act of 1999 (AIPA) and the Intellectual Property and High Technology Technical Amendments Act of 2002 do not apply when the reference is a U.S. patent resulting directly or indirectly from an international application filed before November 29, 2000. Therefore, the prior art date of the



Art Unit: 2143

reference is determined under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) prior to the amendment by the AIPA (pre-AIPA 35 U.S.C. 102(e)).

23. Claims 1, 29 – 34, 37 – 41, 44 – 48, 51 – 54, 57 – 59, 62, 63, 65 – 68, 70, 73, 74, 76 – 79, 81 and 84 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Wiegel U.S. Patent No. 6484261.

24. Referencing claim 1, as closely interpreted by the Examiner, Wiegel teaches a communications services controller for a communications network comprising a plurality of communications systems connected to a network resource; a plurality of user devices connected to the services controller, the user services having a capability to use at least one of the communications systems; a plurality of contact devices connected to the network resource and having a capability to use at least one of the communications systems, some of the contact devices being additionally user devices, the services controller comprising, (e.g. col. 7, lines 38 – 60, “*network objects, list or rules*”):-

25. (a) a user directory comprising:

26. a user identifier, (e.g. col. 7, lines 38 – 60, “*network objects, list or rules*”);

27. data on all communications systems available to the user including a unique identifier for each communications system, and access data to allow the user device access the available communications systems, (e.g. col. 7, lines 38 – 60, “*network objects, list or rules*”);

28. (b) a roles and privileges logic controller comprising means for controlling access to a desired communications system on a user requesting to use the communications system, the roles

Art Unit: 2143

and privileges logic controller having means for storing access rules based on the roles and privileges allocated to the user, and means to provide access based on the said access rules;

29. (c) a contacts directory comprising a contacts identifier, data on each communications system available to the contact device, including a unique identifier for each communications system available to the contact device for use in the managed network resource, (e.g. col. 7, lines 38 – 60, “*network objects, list or rules*”);

30. (d) an intercommunications server having means for contacting and opening communications using a communications system connected to the network resource between a user device and a contacts device on receiving an access permitted signal, said intercommunications server having means to obtain the necessary access data for the user device from the user directory and for the contact device from the contacts directory, (e.g. col. 7, lines 38 – 60, “*network objects, list or rules*”).

31. As per claim 29, as closely interpreted by the Examiner, Wiegel teaches the roles and privileges logic controller comprises means for storing a record of the access to a communications system obtained by a user during a preset period, (e.g. col. 24, lines 25 – 43).

32. Claims 30 – 34, 37 – 41, 44 – 48, 51 – 54, 57 – 59, 62, 63, 65 – 68, 70, 73, 74, 76 – 79, 81 and 84 are rejected for similar reasons stated above.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

Art Unit: 2143

33. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

34. Claims 2 – 8, 10, 11, 14 – 16, 18 – 25, 28, 64 and 75 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wiegel (6484261) as applied to claims 1 above, and in view of LaRosa et al. (6628965) (hereinafter LaRosa).

35. As per claim 2, as closely interpreted by the Examiner, Wiegel does not specifically teach the intercommunications server comprises means for allowing a user device access more than one communications system simultaneously for contact with the one contact device. LaRosa teaches the intercommunications server comprises means for allowing a user device access more than one communications system simultaneously for contact with the one contact device, (e.g. col. 5, lines 39 – 58). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill of the art, at the time the invention was conceived, to combine LaRosa with Wiegel because it would be more convenient for a user to have the ability to communicate with multiple devices if there is other information that one device cannot provide.

36. As per claim 3, as closely interpreted by the Examiner, Wiegel does not specifically teach the intercommunications server comprises means for allowing a user device access more than one communications system simultaneously for contact with another contact device while communicating with a different contact device, (e.g. col. 5, lines 39 – 58). It would have been

Art Unit: 2143

obvious to one of ordinary skill of the art, at the time the invention was conceived, to combine LaRosa with Wiegel because of similar reasons stated above.

37. As per claim 4, as closely interpreted by the Examiner, Wiegel teaches the roles and privileges logic controller comprises means for storing a record of the access to a communications system obtained by a user during a preset period, (e.g. col. 24, lines 25 – 43).

38. As per claim 5, as closely interpreted by the Examiner, Wiegel teaches the roles and privileges logic controller comprises:-

39. means for defining a privilege as an access rule to a specified communications system, (e.g. col. 7, lines 38 – 60, “*network objects, list or rules*”);

40. means for defining a plurality of privileges, (e.g. col. 7, lines 38 – 60, “*network objects, list or rules*”); and

41. means to allocate at least one privilege to each user, (e.g. col. 7, lines 38 – 60, “*network objects, list or rules*”).

42. As per claim 6, as closely interpreted by the Examiner, Wiegel teaches the roles and privileges logic controller comprises:-

43. means for defining a privilege as an access rule to a specified service provided on a specified communications systems, (e.g. col. 7, lines 38 – 60, “*network objects, list or rules*”);

44. means for defining a plurality of privileges, (e.g. col. 7, lines 38 – 60, “*network objects, list or rules*”); and

Art Unit: 2143

45. means to allocate at least one privilege to each user, (e.g. col. 7, lines 38 – 60, “*network objects, list or rules*”).

46. As per claim 7, as closely interpreted by the Examiner, Wiegel teaches the roles and privileges logic controller comprises:-

47. means for defining a privilege as an access rule to a specified communications system, (e.g. col. 7, lines 38 – 60, “*network objects, list or rules*”);

48. means for defining a plurality of privileges, (e.g. col. 7, lines 38 – 60, “*network objects, list or rules*”);

49. means to allocate at least one privilege to each user and in which the privilege is one or more of, (e.g. col. 7, lines 38 – 60, “*network objects, list or rules*”):-

50. total duration of use within a specified time period, (e.g. col. 24, lines 25 – 43),

51. usage between specified times during any day,

52. monetary limits over a specified time limit,

53. incoming use only,

54. user device limitation,

55. number of users already provided with the system traffic handling capabilities,

56. privilege communications

57. priority of access with respect to other users,

58. nature of contact which it is desired to communicate with.

Art Unit: 2143

59. As per claim 8, as closely interpreted by the Examiner, Wiegel teaches the roles and privileges logic controller comprises:-

60. means for defining a privilege as an access rule to a specified service provided on a specified communications systems, (e.g. col. 7, lines 38 – 60, “*network objects, list or rules*”);

61. means for defining a plurality of privileges, (e.g. col. 7, lines 38 – 60, “*network objects, list or rules*”);

62. means to allocate at least one privilege to each user and in which the privilege is one or more of:

63. total duration of use within a specified time period, (e.g. col. 24, lines 25 – 43),

64. usage between specified times during any day,

65. monetary limits over a specified time limit,

66. incoming use only,

67. user device limitation,

68. number of users already provided with the privilege communications system traffic handling capabilities,

69. priority of access with respect to other users,

70. nature of contact which it is desired to communicate with.

71. As per claim 10, as closely interpreted by the Examiner, Wiegel teaches a closed messaging device for the reception and storage of messages for nominated user devices, (e.g. col. 7, lines 38 – 60 & col. 9, lines 18 – 34).

Art Unit: 2143

72. As per claim 11, as closely interpreted by the Examiner, Wiegel teaches a closed messaging device for the reception and storage of messages for nominated user devices and includes means to receive and store messages from disparate messaging services, (e.g. col. 9, lines 61 – 67).

73. As per claim 14, as closely interpreted by the Examiner, Wiegel teaches means to allow users access to view a document, (e.g. col. 7, lines 4 – 10);

74. means to allow the user edit the document, (e.g. col. 7, lines 4 – 10);

75. means to store the changes in the document due to editing by a user, said changes being identified by user, (e.g. col. 7, lines 4 – 10 & col. 7, lines 20 – 37).

76. As per claim 15, as closely interpreted by the Examiner, Wiegel teaches the network resource is the internet, (e.g. col. 7, lines 28 – 37).

77. As per claim 16, as closely interpreted by the Examiner, Wiegel teaches the network resource is the extranet, (e.g. col. 7, lines 28 – 37).

78. As per claim 18, as closely interpreted by the Examiner, Wiegel teaches the roles and privileges logic controller includes means to provide an access permitted signal and an access denied signal, (e.g. col. 7, lines 38 – 60 & col. 9, lines 18 – 34).

79. Claims 19 – 25, 28, 64 and 75 are rejected for similar reasons as stated above.

80. Claims 9, 12, 13, 17, 26, 27 and 69 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wiegel and LaRosa as applied to claims 1 & 2 above, and in further view of Farrell et al. (6751663) (hereinafter Farrell).

81. As per claim 9, as closely interpreted by the Examiner, Wiegel and LaRosa do not specifically teach a conferencing server having means to allow a user device contact the server, and

82. means in the server to aggregate the data to and from each user device to provide a single incoming and outgoing data stream independent of the number of users. Farrell teaches a conferencing server having means to allow a user device contact the server, (e.g. col. 21, lines 11 – 35), and

83. means in the server to aggregate the data to and from each user device to provide a single incoming and outgoing data stream independent of the number of users, (e.g. col. 21, lines 11 – 35). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill of the art, at the time the invention was conceived, to combine Farrell with the combine system of Wiegel and LaRosa because aggregating data provides the ability to combine base level activity information in a flexible way to meet the specific needs of the end-user/application.

84. As per claim 12, as closely interpreted by the Examiner, Wiegel and LaRosa do not specifically teach a unified messaging server having means for storing store-forward-messaging services. Farrell teaches a unified messaging server having means for storing store-forward-



Art Unit: 2143

messaging services, (e.g. col. 17, line 47 – col. 18, line 17). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill of the art, at the time the invention was conceived, to combine Farrell with the combine system of Wiegel and LaRosa because store and forward capabilities provide a measure of fault tolerance at this accounting process level to ensure reliable data transfer.

85. As per claim 13, as closely interpreted by the Examiner, Wiegel and LaRosa teach all that is similar above in this claim, more specifically a server that has the ability to store email for a system to view to see if the email can pass the gate way but does not specifically teach a unified messaging server having means for storing store-forward-messaging services. Farrell teaches a unified messaging server having means for storing store-forward-messaging services, (e.g. col. 17, line 47 – col. 18, line 17). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill of the art, at the time the invention was conceived, to combine Farrell with the combine system of Wiegel and LaRosa because of similar reasons stated above.

86. As per claim 17, as closely interpreted by the Examiner, Wiegel and LaRosa does not specifically teach the network resource is the intranet. Farrell teaches the network resource is the intranet, (e.g. col. 5, line 56 – col. 6, line 11). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill of the art, at the time the invention was conceived, to combine Farrell with the combine system of Wiegel and LaRosa because

87. Claims 26, 27 and 69 are rejected for similar reasons as stated above.

Art Unit: 2143

88. Claims 35, 36, 42, 43, 49, 50, 55, 56, 60, 61, 71, 72, 80, 82, 83, 85 – 90, 93, 94, 96, 97 – 101, 104, 105, 107 – 113, 115, 116, 118 – 121, 124 and 125 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wiegel as applied to claims 1 & 29 above, and in view of Farrell et al. (6751663) (hereinafter Farrell).

89. As per claim 35, as closely interpreted by the Examiner, Wiegel does not specifically teach a unified messaging server having means for storing store-forward-messaging services. Farrell teaches a unified messaging server having means for storing store-forward-messaging services, (e.g. col. 17, line 47 – col. 18, line 17). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill of the art, at the time the invention was conceived, to combine Farrell with Wiegel because store and forward capabilities provide a measure of fault tolerance at this accounting process level to ensure reliable data transfer.

90. As per claim 36, as closely interpreted by the Examiner, Wiegel teaches all that is similar above in this claim, more specifically a server that has the ability to store email for a system to view to see if the email can pass the gate way but does not specifically teach a unified messaging server having means for storing store-forward-messaging services. Farrell teaches a unified messaging server having means for storing store-forward-messaging services, (e.g. col. 17, line 47 – col. 18, line 17). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill of the art, at the time the invention was conceived, to combine Farrell with Wiegel because of similar reasons stated above.

Art Unit: 2143

91. Claims 42, 43, 49, 50, 55, 56, 60, 61, 71, 72, 80, 82, 83, 85 – 90, 93, 94, 96, 97 – 101, 104, 105, 107 – 113, 115, 116, 118 – 121, 124 and 125 are rejected for similar reasons as stated above.

### ***Conclusion***

92. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

93. a. Chung et al. U.S. Patent No. 6470389 discloses Hosting a network service on a cluster of servers using a single-address image.

94. b. Shimbo et al. U.S. Patent No. 6092191 discloses Packet authentication and packet encryption/decryption scheme for security gateway.

95. c. Fan et al. U.S. Patent No. 6219706 discloses Access control for networks.

96. d. Thomas U.S. Patent No. 6401118 discloses Method and computer program product for an online monitoring search engine.

97. e. Fuh et al. U.S. Patent No. 6463474 discloses Local authentication of a client at a network device.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to David E. England whose telephone number is 571-272-3912.

The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Thur, 7:00-5:00.

Art Unit: 2143

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, David A. Wiley can be reached on 571-272-3923. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

David E. England  
Examiner  
Art Unit 2143

De



DAVID WILEY  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100